facility is 87,065 L/day (23,000 gal/day). Even at the lowest operating capacity of MPF, the capacity of the sewage treatment plant would be exceeded and would require expansion.

Solid sanitary wastes generated by MPF (450 ppy) would be expected to increase the total from WIPP by a factor of 12. This would accelerate DOE's consumption of available capacity in both onsite and offsite facilities.

5.9 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Implementing any of the MPF alternatives analyzed in this EIS would result in unavoidable adverse impacts on the environment. Generally, the impacts are small and would be from the construction and operation of new facilities at any one of the five locations analyzed.

Operations at Los Alamos Site, NTS, SRS, Pantex Site, or Carlsbad Site would all result in unavoidable radiation exposure to workers and the general public. Workers would be exposed to direct radiation and other chemicals associated with operating MPF and handling and transporting radioactive waste. The public would be exposed to radioactive contaminants released to the air and through exposure to radioactive materials, including waste, that would be transported both to the proposed MPF and to ultimate disposition sites for radioactive wastes. Discussion of the health effects to workers and the public is included in Sections 5.2.9, 5.3.9, 5.4.9, 5.5.9, and 5.6.9. Potential transportation impacts are described in Sections 5.2.12, 5.3.12, 5.4.12, 5.5.12, and 5.6.12.

Unavoidable quantities of radioactive and nonradioactive wastes would be generated by implementing any of the MPF alternatives. This waste would need to be segregated, stored, managed, and transported to final disposal locations.

Discussion of Air Impacts

For all alternatives, various chemical and radiological constituents would be released to the air. Generally, nonradiological releases would result in incremental increases of less than 1 percent. For radiological releases, while the incremental increases compared to the baseline and all reasonably foreseeable actions is large for most alternatives, the actual releases for all alternatives would result in a dose significantly less than the DOE and EPA standard of 10 mrem/yr. Additionally, there would be temporary and localized effects on air quality from associated construction and excavation activities.

There would also be temporary impacts from the construction of new facilities associated with the MPF project. These impacts would consist of increased fugitive dust, increased potential for erosion and stormwater pollution, and increased construction vehicle traffic and emissions.

5.10 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM USES

Implementation of any of the alternatives would require short-term commitments of resources such as land use and permanent commitment of resources such as energy.